IQRO JURNALI , IQRO JOURNAL, ИКРО ЖУРНАЛИ
ISSN:2181-4341| wordlyknowledge.uz/index.php/iqro
Volume 22 Issue 02 IYUL 2026

THE PRINCIPLE OF ECONOMY OF LANGUAGE LEVELS AND ITS IMPACT ON LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

Shafagat Abdulla Mahmudova
Doctor, doctor, Professor
Azerbaijan University of Languages, Baku, Azerbaijan
E.mail: shafagat.m@gmail.com
ORCID: https://orcid.orq/0000-0002-8109-9318
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21335299

ABSTRACT

The principle of economy of language levels is universal. This means that it manifests itself in all languages and affects the development of the language as a whole. It is realized at all levels of the language system, namely, at the phonetic, lexical, grammatical and stylistic levels. It is subconscious in nature and is most widespread in dialogic speech. The theory and practice of the principle of economy of language are relevant in modern linguistics, as they reflect the objective changes taking place in society and language in the era of global digitalization and the accelerated pace of information processing. This article summarizes the existing knowledge about the principle of economy of language in chronological order and presents the results of a linguistic study of the comparative nature of the vocabulary of the Russian, English and Chinese languages at all language levels.

Keywords: The principle of economy of language; universal character; English, Chinese, Russian languages; levels of the language system; speech efforts; communication.

Introduction

All language processes are subject to certain laws and principles, and they are divided into several parts: universal, frequent and unique. "In modern linguistics, universals, typologies and specifics are the areas of interest of a single science. In fact, this trinity constitutes the science of "Linguistics" ... since each language necessarily contains elements common to all languages, as well as elements that are only in a certain language group, and of course there is a third component, that is, elements that are specific only to that language" [1, p. 91]. The law of economy of speech efforts and the law of expressive-emotional richness of speech are among the main laws of glottogenesis and linguogenesis, and they are in tension with each other, which confirms the law of Hegelian dialectics. People try to minimize language means and techniques in communication, but the aesthetic beauty, emotional impact and informative content of speech are also very important in the process of communication. Our study, which aims to confirm the universality of the principle of language economy using English, Chinese and Russian, uses methods of comparison, generalization and description to summarize the accumulated knowledge and experience on this topic and identifies prospects for future work, thus substantiating the relevance and importance of studying language economy in the modern world of global digitalization. There is a socio-pragmatic explanation for changes in language. Language, as a means of social interaction, interpersonal communication and meaningful human interaction with the surrounding reality, is always changing and adapting to the changing conditions of human communication.

Discussion

At the end of the 18th century, discussions began about the principle of human communication known as "linguistic acceleration" or "linguistic economy". This was understood

as the use of various expressive means that facilitate the reduction (compression, reduction) of linguistic information. Since people always have something more important to do than spend time building sentences and want to save their interlocutors from unnecessary conversations and writing, their linguistic communication is often hasty and fragmented. However, such linguistic behavior often corresponds to the expectations of the German-speaking communication partner. Firstly, because it corresponds to certain features of the German mentality (the desire for order and economy), and secondly, because it corresponds to the principles of cooperation proposed by the American philosopher H.P. Grice. According to these principles, depending on the situation, one should say only what is "important or necessary" and only "what is relevant to the content of a given conversation" [6, p. 224]. Such a businesslike and economical presentation of information promotes linguistic clarity and accuracy: by shortening the content (meaning) of the expression, avoiding unnecessary words and grammatical structures, the interlocutor clearly and concisely formulates the idea, emphasizing its essence. We can say that the principle of linguistic economy is a kind of compromise between the needs of verbal communication and the desire of a person to minimize the effort spent on this. Signs of linguistic economy are inherent in all styles of German communicative behavior, but they are especially manifested in the language of the press and journalism, which is characterized by the active use of expressively colorful constructions. The simultaneous excessive abundance of news information and the lack of time inherent in modern life require accessibility and speed of obtaining information. The desire for expressiveness often leads to the use of figurative constructions of speech with the omission of one or another part of the sentence. This, in turn, increases the need for content (text) compression and (linguistic) economy, and leads to new structural linguistic changes that can be traced both at the lexical and syntactic levels. In the dictionary, this is achieved through the use of foreign words (mainly from English), compound words, and nominal style, which are borrowed on the basis of linguistic economy. In syntax, linguistic economy manifests itself in shorter sentences, fewer subordinate clauses, and simpler sentences, as well as in the use of constructions that are often separated by grammatical violations. There are several reasons for the active use of English borrowings or Anglicisms, including in the language of the press and journalism. First, since German and English are languages of the same West Germanic language group, their systems have much in common. Therefore, English words easily adapt to German grammar and become Germanic. For example, many English verbs take the German infinitive ending -en, which becomes the accusative suffix and is used in all tenses of the German language: liken, twittern, skypen, googeln, mailen: ichmaile, du mailest, er hat gemailt…etc. English nouns take on gender, suffix, plural forms and are also declined according to the rules of the German language: der Banker, der Lobbyist, die Fairness, die Publicity, das Bodybuilding, das Apartment: des Lobbyisten, dem Lobbyisten, den Lobbyisten. Secondly, there are still mainly technical and financial-economic fields where German equivalents are practically non-existent or very difficult to find, for example digital media (digitale Medien) or modern technology and know-how (Know-how).

Even the familiar word "Manager" sounds like this in German: mit austeinerVerfügungsgewalt und Entscheidungsbefugnis ausgestante leitende Persönlichkeit eines Großunternehmens. Thirdly, of course, Englishisms, due to their imagery, unusualness and permissibility of wordplay, create opportunities for original and creative writing and have a special degree of impact on the reader: “Derrätselhafte Killerpilz – News from Boston” (science), “Airlines kämpfen Trollet” (economics), “Ryan Giggs wird Nationalcoach von Wales” (sports), “Auch diese JobPannen sorgten für Chaos” (politics), “Wir bräuchten mehr Dates mit uns selber” [20]. The principle of thrift is based on the idea that human activity is purposeful and aims to achieve the goal with the least effort. If we consider the application of this principle outside linguistics, we can see some similarities with the regularities studied in the natural

sciences. Thus, K. Cherry makes the following analogy with planetary motion, which obeys the principle of “least motion”: “Planets follow ‘natural’ orbits in their movements; any other orbit is 'unnatural' and means more movement." However, it is characteristic that while in the natural sciences very specific, measurable physical quantities are used to determine economy, in linguistics the manifestation of economy is seen in a wide variety of linguistic phenomena and processes that cannot be clearly measured[6]. The problem of economy in linguistics, from one point of view or another and under one name or another - compression, combination, contraction, reduction, elimination, folding, elliptical sentences, etc. - has repeatedly attracted the attention of researchers in the study of various disciplines and individual linguistic phenomena [1, 5]. The principle of economy in language was formulated by the French linguist A. Martine.[14]. According to this principle, language change is a compromise between the needs of communication and the desire to minimize human effort. A. Martine, who formulated the principle of economy in language, noted: “The practical needs of communication imply a permanent or very significant excess of the linguistic form inherent in all levels of the latter. "[14, p. 237]. At the same time, he noted that the constant contradiction between the needs of human communication and the desire to minimize mental and physical effort can be considered decisive in changing the language system [14, p. 232-233]. A. Martine refers many linguistic phenomena to the field of linguistic economy. In this regard, he writes: "The term "economy" covers everything: the elimination of useless differences, the emergence of new differences and the preservation of the existing situation. Economy in language is a synthesis of acting forces" [14, p. 130]. The scientist believes that the principle of linguistic economy or the law of least effort plays an important role in the evolution of language, given that a balance is created at any moment between the need to introduce new elements and the need to use existing ones. This fact prompted A. Martine to demonstrate the existence of two types of economy in language: syntagmatic economy and paradigmatic economy [14, p. 229]. In linguistics, syntagmatic economy involves the use of language elements or constructions to achieve maximum information content with a minimum amount of expression. It is associated with the selection of words or expressions in the context in order to convey meaning with the least number of elements used, thereby having an effective and concise communicative effect [7, p. 286]. Thus, when choosing between two terms denoting the same reality - photocopier or xerox - the speaker will prefer the shorter word formed by converting a proper noun into a common noun, rather than using long expressions such as "photocopier" or "xerox". Paradigmatic economy consists in keeping the units of the language system the same number and combining them to designate new aspects of reality. In the context of purely linguistics, the French linguist Jean Dubois and others argue that "the principle of linguistic economy is based on the synthesis of contradictory forces (the need for communication and inertia) that constantly conflict in the life of languages." A. Martine was undoubtedly inspired by the works of J. Zipf, since there is evidence that the full definition of the term " economy " appeared in the scientist's works only after 1949: he speaks of the tendency to economy as a composition of two opposing forces - the limitation of effort on the one hand and the need for satisfaction on the other - while in his previous works A. Martine spoke only of the tendency to economy of means or good economy of the system [14, p. 128]. David Crystal believes that economy "is a criterion in linguistics that, among other things, requires the brevity of analysis and the use of as few terms as possible" [3, p. 155].

The authors of the "Dictionary of Linguistics" (editor J. Munen) claim that "the economy of language is the result of the application of the principle of least effort to the function of communication. Thus, the existence of two levels of articulation in all known languages is a consequence of the application of this principle". [16, p. 119]. The authors, in particular, add to their definition that "this concept of economy implies the existence of a dynamic language, that is, the existence of an equilibrium position that is always in doubt between the forces existing in

the structure, the tendency of inertia that pushes a person to limit the value of his communication, and the need to ensure mutual understanding" [16]. It is in the context of this dynamic language that we try to learn various "economical" language means available to modern man - always in a hurry - for faster communication, in a constant desire to increase the efficiency of any action. There are several reasons for the tendency to abbreviation. First of all, in English there is a tendency to brevity due to the strong tonal accent, which is more pronounced than in other European languages \u200b\u200b[16, p. 201]. Probably, the main reason for the use of lexical abbreviations in modern scientific terminology is brevity and clarity: scientists using classical vocabulary try to convey as much information as possible in their neologisms. When considering the evolution of the English language, there are many possible reasons, including functional, affective and psychological ones: brevity, clarity and the need to adapt the language to the pace of modern life, i.e. the need to present information as concisely as possible in order to avoid unnecessary redundancy, such as the repetition of multiple terms and the fact that the names of organizations are too long to fit comfortably in documents, commercial or advertising materials. The increasing frequency of abbreviations has long been observed not only in certain areas of communication, but also by linguists. The Czech linguist Jozef Hrbacek noted in 1979 that the frequency of abbreviations is increasing not only in certain scientific or administrative environments, but also in ordinary everyday communication, which raises the question of clarity of expression [7, p. 82]. Long-studied words caused some concern among scholars, and not only because technical terms turned into a kind of tongue twister. Another reason for the use of lexical abbreviations in English is laziness [5], but this tendency is not limited to all spoken languages today languages. In part, this is the same linguistic laziness that manifests itself in incomplete sentences and phrases. Most second-language learners of English quickly realize that they pronounce their language differently from how native speakers spell it. For example, why don't native speakers say "going to" or "want to" more clearly? What exactly does the word "gonna" or "wanna" mean? It's not just "going to" as you often hear in "gonna see you later," but never "I'm gonna cinema." This can be explained by phonological reduction and elimination. On the one hand, speakers who do not skip or shorten their speech may sound overly formal and somewhat unnatural because they do not use the rhythmic patterns and intonation that are indicators of fluency. On the other hand, many native speakers claim that they do not shorten words because this is a sign of "lazy" and weak English. But even at the most formal levels of English, speakers often resort to this method not only phonologically, but also graphically. Most importantly, the influence of the Internet on the growth of both abbreviations and other types of abbreviations is significant. As linguist N. A. Akhrenova notes: "Researchers identify the most characteristic features of Internet language precisely on the basis of original online genres. It is in these genres that linguistic innovations are most fully implemented. By studying them, it is easier to identify the possible directions of influence of the Internet language on the general literary language" [1, p. 120]. Indeed, the typical features of the Internet language are often manifested through online genres (arising from the online use of language), which stimulate linguistic innovation. Studying these genres allows us to better understand how the Internet language influences the general literary language and to identify the possible directions of this influence. The Internet creates a unique linguistic space where people actively interact and creatively experiment with language. This contributes to the emergence of new words, expressions and grammatical constructions that can become part of the general spoken language over time. Thus, the impact of the Internet on language expands the boundaries of linguistic changes and cultural transformations, bringing new elements and contexts to language practice.

British linguist Pavol Kvetko characterizes the processes of shortening as the tendency of modern English to monosyllabicity, and thus, as a process in which part of the original word is taken away. These processes are united by "various combinations of violations of the basic

features of morphological grammar" [12, p. 3]. Let us consider some specific methods of linguistic saving in English. Stem shortening (truncation). The term "truncation" refers to the process in which, after being applied to a polysyllabic word, only part of the stem is retained in the newly formed lexical item. The process of truncation does not affect the meaning of the lexical item and its word class affiliation; both of these properties remain unchanged in the new shortened version. N. V. Pletneva argues that shortening has certain advantages over other methods, since it allows the formation of new stem words that can later form words [19, p. 70]. Saving is often called the vertical norm of colloquial style. The unity of the functional style is created by a whole complex of similar phenomena at different linguistic levels. At the morphological level of the language, the principle of economy is associated with using the minimum number of morphemes (the least significant word elements) to convey specific information. This principle is also known as the principle of morpheme economy. This principle is based on an idea formulated by linguist Leonard Bloomfield as part of his work in the field of morphology. Bloomfield hypothesized that languages strive to minimize the number of morphemes in words in order to maximize the economy of expression of semantic and grammatical information. Let's consider this principle using the example of affixation (word formation using affixes) in language. Many languages have word roots to which prefixes, suffixes, infixes, etc. can be added to change the meaning. The principle of morpheme economy is that a language uses the least number of affixes to create various word forms. For example, in English, the prefix “un-” is used to form negative words (e.g., “happy”–“unhappy”), which is more efficient than having a separate unique word for each negative form. In Russian, there are various ways to change the root of a word when forming different forms. For example, when forming plural forms of nouns or changing verb forms taking into account tense and person, the language tries to use the minimum number of morphemes to convey the necessary grammatical information. Examples: - "Home" - "at home" (singular - plural, one morpheme) - "I read" - "reads" (1 person singular - 3 persons singular, one morpheme). At the morphological level, the principle of economy is important for conserving language resources, reducing the redundancy and complexity of the morphological structure, and increasing the effectiveness of communication and understanding. This principle is also directly related to the phenomenon of language economy in general and confirms the thesis of the efficiency of language tools and structures. Because less complex morphological systems can facilitate the learning and use of language in everyday communication. Thus, at the morphological level, the principle of economy represents an important aspect of linguistic organization, ensuring the efficient transmission of information with a minimum number of morphemes, promoting clarity and economy of language resources. With the intensification, digitalization and globalization of all spheres of human life, language transformations are becoming more and more widespread. In our opinion, one of the main manifestations of language change is the tendency to simplify, save and at the same time maximize the efficiency of communication. This applies to the language as a whole, and therefore we can talk about the universality of the principle of economy (Economy Principle) in language, which manifests itself in the following issues:

The principle of economy is one of the main causes of change in all languages and affects the development of language as a whole;

– The principle of economy is realized at all levels of the language system;

– The principle of economy is unconscious in nature, that is, it is usually not recognized by a person during verbal interaction;

– The principle of economy is most often used and widespread in colloquial dialogic speech.

Modern linguists also study the economy of linguistic effort in different languages [11–15]. They all come to the common conclusion that linguistic compression, also known as the principle of economy, is designed to convey rich, informative content in a simple and

concise form. Modern people value time very much; they are pragmatic and rational, ready for constructive dialogue in order to achieve their goals with minimal cost and effort. The environment shapes language, and language participates in the formation of the environment - this is a mutually conditioned process. We witness significant changes in language, which adapts to the rapidly accelerating pace of modern life.

Like any system, language has a hierarchical structure; It is this multilayered structure that makes the language flexible and efficient, capable of providing expressive and meaningful speech. In order to maximize effective communication, there is always a choice and variability of various language means. It should be noted that the principle of economy in language necessarily implies successful communication, that is, both parties participating in the dialogue must demonstrate their abilities: the speaker is able to create a concise and concise language speech, and the listener is able to quickly and adequately understand the information received. Therefore, dialogue in the broad sense - and this type of verbal interaction has long been used not only in everyday conversation, but also in the media, advertising, scientific and political discourse - most successfully and convincingly implements the principle of economy in language. It is especially interesting that when choosing language means, people often subconsciously and intuitively follow such criteria as simplicity, brevity, convenience and intelligibility. It is important to save effort, save time and shorten the process of mutual understanding.

Each level of the language uses its own means to implement the principle of economy in language. We will consider examples from each level separately, but in everyday speech, saving speech effort can manifest itself in a complex way, that is, at several levels simultaneously. At the phonetic level, colloquial speech is characterized by "incomplete type" pronunciation, omission of individual elements, reduction of vowels, and compression associated with the selection of appropriate intonation. Let us consider a few examples:

In Russian:

Здравствуйте, Александр Александрович!-Hello, Aleksandr Aleksandrovich!

Здравствуйте, Сан-Санич!-Hello, San Sanych!

In English:

I ‘d have told you-I should have told you

In Chinese:

Nǐ zuò shénme (What are you doing?)

Nǐ gàn shà (What are you doing?)

It seems interesting to give examples of the application of the "law of least effort" at the phonetic level in online communication, when the interlocutors are limited only to visual perception. Here, graphic forms are actively used - printing words in all capital letters to simulate loudness or increasing the number of certain letters to express certain emotional states. For example,

in Russian:

Огромное спасибо за помощь!-Thank you VERY much for your help!

Ура! Мы очень довольны!-Hurray! We are very pleased!

in English:

THANK YOU VERY MUCH!-THANK YOU VERY MUCH!

Hello-Hello!

In Chinese, an additional emotional contagion effect during virtual communication is achieved through the repetition of words:

对，对！ (Yes, yes, you are right!)

可以，可以！ (Of course you can!)

谢谢，谢谢！ (Thank you very much!)

At the lexical level, the law of economy is active in the field of word creation. On the one hand, the desire for brevity and simplicity of words, and on the other hand, the desire to fully preserve the meaning, has led to the use of a large number of abbreviations in speech. Abbreviations reduce the material shell of language units and increase the speed of information flow, that is, they serve as a means of concentrating information, saving the speaker's time and speech effort [16].

In Russian: ВУЗ (higher educational institution), МГУ (Moscow State University),
завуч (head of academic department).
In English: UCLA (The University of California), MBA
(Master of Business Administration), DOB (date of birth).
In Chinese:

北大（**北京大学**），**科技**术（科技术））,

公交（**公交交**）.

Another example of abbreviations are untranslated borrowings, otherwise called transplantation [7, p. 173]. Charles University: BBC (British Broadcasting Corporation), PC (Personal

Computer), HSK (汉语水平考试 Hànyǔ Shuǐpíng) Kǎoshì), RMB (**人民博** RénMínBì).

There are universal examples of abbreviations that are completely identical in different languages.

For example:

etc., etc. (et cetera), **等**语 — and so on

that is, (id est), **即** — that is

km/h, kph (kilometers per hour), **关**时 — kilometers per hour.

The modern lifestyle of people, constant virtual communication and the increasing flow of information contribute to the active use of abbreviations that significantly compress information and save time. Expressive abbreviations that briefly but accurately express the recipient's thoughts and emotions are used on the Internet. In Russian:

спс (thank you)
пжлста (please)
мб (maybe).
In English:
AUOK? — Are you okay?
KIT — Keep in touch
BBS — I'll be back soon
IMO — In my opinion
LOL — Laughing out loud
OMG — Oh my God, oh my God, oh my God
In Chinese:

XSWL **笑死我了** xiào sǐ wǒle (literally 'laughing to death') instead of LOL (laughing out loud)

DBQ 对不起 duìbùqǐ (excuse me, I apologize)

BS **鄙**视 bǐshì (to hate, to despise).

The Chinese language is increasingly incorporating alphabetic words, gradually moving from slang and terminological vocabulary to everyday Chinese. It is in the process of virtual communication that there is a fundamental need for economical expression of thoughts and elimination of information redundancy, which is achieved by reducing lexical units as a way to

optimize speech communication.

Conclusion

The above analysis of the methods of economy of language levels reveals the multifaceted strategies used by language to achieve maximum information content with minimal use of language resources. These methods reflect its effectiveness in conveying information, as well as the desire to save effort on the part of the speaker and the recipient. In conclusion, it should be emphasized that studying the economy of language resources not only expands our knowledge of the structure and functionality of language, but also has practical significance for areas where clarity and effectiveness of communication are important. Understanding the mechanisms of the principle of economy in language can be useful in education, translation, rhetoric, and other areas where the skills of precise and concise expression are important.

REFERENCES

1. Akhrenova N. A. Linguistic features of microblogs // Almanac of modern science and education. 2011. No. 9 (52). P. 119–124.
2. Varbot Zh. Zh., Zhuravlev A. F. Brief conceptual and terminological reference book on etymology and historical lexicology. Vinogradov Institute of the Russian Language, Russian Academy of Sciences, 1998.
3. Crystal D. A Dictionary of Linguistics & Phonetics. 5th ed. London, 2003.
4. Dressler W. Naturalness and morphological change. In: Joseph B. D. and Janda R. D. The Handbook of Historical Linguistics Oxford: Blackwell, 2003. P. 461–471.
5. Dubois J. et al. Dictionnaire de linguistique et des sciences du langage. Paris: Larousse, 2002.
6. Grice G.P. Logic and speech communication// New in foreign linguistics.-1985.-Issue 16.-P.222-229
7. Hrbacek J. Jazykové zkratky v češtině. Univerzita Karlova, Praha, 1979.
8. Halliday M. A. K., Ruqaiya H. Cohesion in English. London: Longman Group Limited, 1976. 374 p.
9. Ivanilova N. E. Structural and semantic features of elliptical sentences in French and English: author's abstract. diss. … Cand. Sc. (Philology). Rostov Institute of Foreign Languages. 2008. 156 p.
10. Irimia D. Curs de lingvistică generală. 3rd ed. Editura Universității "Alexandru Ioan Cuza", 2011.
11. Kreidler Ch. Creating new words by shortening // Journal of English Linguistics. 1979. No. 13. P. 24–36.
12. Kvetko P. English Lexicology. Edičné stredisko PedF UK, 1994.
13. López Rúa P. Acronyms & Co.: A typology of typologie. In Estudios Ingleses de la Universidad Complutense. Vol. 12. Madrid, 2004. P. 109–129.
14. Martinet A. Économie des changements phonétiques. Berne: Éditions A. Francke S. A., 1955. 396 p.
15. Martinet A. Elements of general linguistics. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960. 226 p.
16. Mounin G. Dictionnaire de la linguistique. 4th. ed. Paris, 2004.
17. Perez Iglesias E. Shortening processes in EST Lexicon. In: Revista de Lenguas para Fines Específicos No. 7–8, 2001. P. 283–293.
18. Peeters B. Diachronie, phonologie, et linguistique fonctionnelle. Institute of linguistics, KU Leuven, 1992.